

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/668,266	HEMSTOCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher Upton	1724	

All Participants:

(1) Christopher Upton.

(2) Sean Goodwin.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 20 July 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 5, 17

Prior art documents discussed:

Collings, Sinex, Chavez


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



**CHRISTOPHER UPTON
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: It was agreed to amend claims 1 and 17 to recite that the lower edge of the flow barrier sets the maximum depth of the belly storage portion and that the spacing of the barrier is such that the particulates intersect the belly storage portion prior to the barrier, to patentably distinguish over the prior art of record It was also agreed to amend claim 5 to clarify the structure claimed...